

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended by adding features of Claim 9 and [Para 26] of this Specification, by reference to Fig. 2, Fig. 3 and associated description thereof. Claim 3 is amended with support that can be found in Fig. 2, Fig.3, [para 28] of this Specification. Claim 10 is amended similarly to amendment applied to Claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, 12 and 13 are canceled. Claims 5, 7, 14, 15 and 16 are amended for keeping consistence with claims depended therefrom. No new matter is added. In summary, Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 14-25 are pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the amendments to the rejected claims and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, Claims 1-25 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being regarded unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,812,789 to Diaz et al. (hereinafter as *Diaz*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,266 to Miyawaki (hereinafter as *Miyawaki*). Applicant carefully studies the reasons stated in this Office Action and previous Office Actions and respectfully submits that the currently amended claims in this Amendment will clearly distinguish themselves from the cited prior art *Diaz* and *Miyawaki*. Applicant respectfully submits following reasons for Examiner's reconsideration.

First, the Office Action explained the relationship between PAL and NTSC signals, corresponding to the first and second bitstreams that allow for the use of three encoding schemes: I-, P- and B-pictures. The Office Action also explained that *Diaz* teaches dropping frames when sharing a memory for an encoder and a decoder. The Office Action further explained that although *Diaz* does not specifically suggest drop B-pictures, *Miyawaki* prioritizes frames based on memory access constraints and suggests that B-picture skip may be performed. With the above reasons, the Office Action concludes that the B-frames would be the frames that get skipped to free up access for the other frame types. Still, Applicant respectfully submits that *Diaz* and

Miyawaki, even being combined, does not suggest deciding an encoding scheme of an encoder based on a current encoding scheme of a decoder found during decoding a decoding bit stream. After all, determining whether to drop a B-picture is one thing, but determining to use B-picture encoding, I-picture encoding or P-picture encoding
5 during encoding is another thing.

Second, amended Claim 1 clearly recites that the encoder selects an encoding scheme according to current encoding scheme of the decoder. If the current encoding scheme of the decoder consumes more bandwidth, e.g. a B-picture encoding, the encoder may select I-picture encoding or P-picture encoding to encode
10 so that the goal of limiting a maximum memory bandwidth required for encoding and decoding is reached. The technical solution of amended Claim 1 does not need to drop a B-picture if the B-picture is found in the decoded bit stream. Instead, amended Claim 1 selects a less complicated encoding scheme applied in the encoder. Therefore, amended Claim 1 is clearly different from *Diaz* and *Miyawaki* because both
15 *Diaz* and *Miyawaki* fail to suggest changing an encoding scheme because of current encoding scheme found during decoding.

Together with previous responses submitted by the Applicant, Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is patentable over *Diaz* in view of *Miyawaki*. Independent Claim 10 is amended similarly and should be patentable
20 with similar reasons. Other pending claims depend from amended Claims 1 or 10 add further features thereon and should be patentable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests rejections to Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 14-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 being withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

5 All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner reconsiders all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition of allowance.

Prompt and favorable considerations of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

10 Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/

Date: 05/04/2010

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

15 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in
20 D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)